

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke xlii: 32.

VOL. IX.

NEW YORK SEPTEMBER 1892.

No. 9

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Specially designed for the enlightenment of
Roman Catholics and their conversion
to Evangelical Christianity.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR, PUBLISHER,
142 West Twenty-first Street,
New York, N. Y.

Subscription Per Year\$1.00

Single Copies, 10 Cents.

Sample copies sent on application.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as
second-class matter

CONTENTS.	PAGE.
Editorial Notes,	258
CONVERTS FROM ROME,	259
A Voice From California,	260
They Cried "Down With the Pope!"	261
Why I Left the Roman Catholic Church,	262
A War on Secret Orders,	267
Recent Roman Persecution in Ireland,	268
Monthly Record of Roman Catholic Events,	269
Neither Corrigan nor Ireland,	271
Was the Apostle Peter Ever at Rome?	272
Rome Again Defeated,	275
The Inquisition an Awful Reality,	276
No Longer a Nun,	278
Sacerdotal Arrogance,	279
Give Catholics the Gospel,	281
Kind Words,	281
Historic Development of Papal Ar- rogations,	282
Jesuits Electing a General,	285
Lives and Miracles of Roman Catholic Saints,	286
Services in Christ's Mission,	288
The Coming Day,	288

SALVATION

FOR

ROMAN CATHOLICS.

JESUS SAID.

They that are whole have no need
of a physician, but they that are sick.

I will have mercy, not sacrifice: for
I came not to call the righteous, but
sinners.

Matt. IX : 12-13.

All that the Father giveth Me shall
come to Me ; and him that cometh to
Me I will in no wise cast out.

For I came down from heaven, not
to do mine own will, but the will of
Him that sent Me.

And this is the will of the Father
who sent Me, that of all which He
hath given Me I should lose nothing,
but should raise it up at the last day.

And this is the will of Him that sent
Me, that every one which seeth the Son,
and believeth on Him, may have ever-
lasting life.

John VI : 37-40.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

WHILE IT IS TRUE THAT THE ROMAN Catholic Church is a great political organization, and that Pope Leo XIII. is lauded as the greatest diplomatist of the age, it should not for one moment be forgotten that the political power has its origin in the spiritual tyranny of the Roman system. The people are told in canons, decrees, sermons and lectures, and especially in the confessional, where they expect to obtain pardon for their sins and be reconciled to God, that if they do not obey their priests, bishops and Pope in all things commanded, they shall be eternally lost.

TO THEM THE TEXT, "WHAT SHALL it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" means that they will surely lose their souls if they are not obedient to the Church, that is, the Pope, bishops and priests. They may lose their souls by sinful, worldly lives, but there is always the hope of repentance and death-bed confession if their faith in the priests has continued. But if that is gone all is lost. That is Roman Catholic doctrine pure and simple.

THE PRIEST IN POLITICS WAS SUPREME in the recent general election in Great Britain when Mr. Gladstone was returned to power by the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, who coerced the people to vote for the clerical candidates. We have not yet come to that in this country, but no man could be elected Mayor of New York without Archbishop Corrigan's endorsement, and in the near future the national candidates may come under his jurisdiction. The chairman of the Repub-

lican National Committee this year, Mr. Carter, is a Roman Catholic, and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Harrity, is a Roman Catholic. By and by the politicians will think the Roman Church is asking too much when it shall force one of its members into the Presidential chair. Meantime preach the Gospel to the Catholics and they will become good citizens and good Christians, free from the yoke of the priests.

THE CONTROVERSY ON THE SCHOOL question in the Roman Catholic ranks continues to be exceedingly bitter. It has become personal and acrimonious between Archbishops Corrigan and Ireland. When the latter returned from Rome with the "tolerari" approval of his Faribault school plan, whereby the parochial schools could become public schools with the nuns as teachers, a banquet had been arranged for him, at which Archbishop Corrigan was to preside. Archbishop Ireland refused to sit at table with Corrigan, whom he charged with stealing, through his agent at Rome, a copy of the memorial he had presented to the Pope. It was represented to Archbishop Ireland that the presence at dinner of Corrigan and himself would cause people to say "How quickly these prelates forget their past differences." To which the bold Ireland replied, "No, but the people would say 'What accomplished hypocrites these prelates are;'" and he left New York without seeing Corrigan.

The quarrels of these prelates will cause many Catholics to lose confidence in them as the representatives of Christ, thus opening the way for the Gospel to reach them.

 CONVERTS FROM ROME.

WE have frequently referred to the carefully selected "Personals" in the editorial page of the New York *Tribune*, and it is with pleasure we cull the following item of news from its issue of August 15, 1892 :

"Mr. Newman Manning, a nephew of Cardinal Manning, has been licensed by a Baptist church in Louisville. He was baptized there a week ago Sunday."

Other relatives of the great English cardinal are members of various Protestant churches. The name of the young Baptist preacher is significant. We hope many other members of both families will follow Newman Manning's example.

Many Roman Catholics have been converted by reading the Bible, even their own Douay version. Last month a member of a firm that employs a large number of hands sent for 100 copies of the Douay Testament, and we believe some of the Catholic workmen who will read it will be led to see and accept the truth.

The great Methodist paper of Boston, *Zions Herald*, July 20, 1892, had the following item of news: "A Roman Catholic priest of the City of Mexico recently visited the Methodist headquarters and made application to be received into the Church. This is the third prominent defection from high circles of Roman Catholicism during a single month."

A member of one of the foremost Roman Catholic families of New

York, a young lady of great beauty and many accomplishments, was married the latter part of May to a Presbyterian, a member of Dr. John Hall's Church, Dr. Hall being the officiating minister. The relatives of the bride wished to have the ceremony performed by Archbishop Corrigan, but the family of the bridegroom would not permit any Popish ceremony. As the young lady is now excommunicated from the Roman Church, we hope she will attend Dr. Hall's Church and learn the true way of salvation.

NEW YORK CITY, July 3, 1892.

DEAR SIR:—The bearer of this, Patrick D—, has just come out from the bondage of Roman Catholicism. He has been faithfully led by two of our dear workers, but as he is undergoing persecution it seems to me it will do him special good to see and talk with a friend like Father O'Connor.

With best wishes for your glorious work's prosperity, yours truly,

MISS I. S. WALDO

YAPHANK, N. Y., June 14, 1892.

DEAR SIR:—My salary being small, I am glad to receive THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC at your special offer to send it to ministers with small salaries for fifty cents a year. I also wish to subscribe for Miss K. S—, a Catholic girl who attends my church. So please find enclosed my check for one dollar for the two subscriptions. May you continue to let the light shine, and may the Divine power bless it so that multitudes may come to the true light as it is in Jesus.

J. M. D.

A VOICE FROM CALIFORNIA

DEAR SIR :—I read your magazine, *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, every month with great interest. I am a converted Catholic, and know that what you say of Rome and the Roman Catholic priests is correct. The whole aim of the Roman Church is, and always has been, to keep the masses in ignorance. The greater the ignorance the greater the servility, and the more ready the obedience to the precepts of the Roman Church. In the United States Rome puts forth greater efforts to educate the masses than in all the Roman Catholic countries put together. This would not be the case if Rome had the same power in this country that she has in them. Take Brazil, for instance, where Rome has had complete control for the last 300 years. Dom Pedro declared that the people in that country were not fit for self government, from the fact that out of 14,000,000 only 1,000,000 could write their own names. The same condition of things would exist in the United States to day were it not for our public schools. Very few parochial schools would be built and supported were it not for our excellent public schools. We are all aware how hard Rome is working to destroy our incomparable system of education. Will she succeed? Will the American people allow their public schools to be destroyed by this foreign Church, whose only aim is power?

A Catholic gentleman, high in his church, said to me one day: "When we get control of the public schools we will divide the school fund to suit ourselves, and what are you going to do about it?" I said to him: "Do you imagine that 57,000,000 of people

would meekly submit and allow the other 8,000,000 to destroy our grand public school system without a protest? Do you know what that protest would be? It would, if necessary, be the Gatling and the Winchester."

The American people have been warned a thousand times by those who know that the whole aim and ambition of Rome is to destroy our public school system. But they themselves do not believe what they say when denouncing the public schools. If the priests of Rome are sincere in their denunciations how is it that they allow their followers to teach in these "godless" schools? More than half the teachers in the public schools of San Francisco are Roman Catholics. Do not these women endanger their soul's salvation by teaching in these infidel schools? But what is far worse, between forty and fifty boys are sent daily from the Youth's Directory, a Roman Catholic institution, to one of our public schools for instruction. Is it not an outrage to send these poor waifs to a "godless" school, thereby endangering their salvation? Rome's motto is "control or destroy," and her priests have got to obey or they are very soon McGlynnized.

The false and infamous charge is made against our public schools that they fill the land with criminals because they are not under control of the priests of the Roman Church. Every one knows that this charge is as false as are the defamers of our schools themselves. The record here in San Francisco proves what I say to be correct. Of 1,200 criminals sent to the House of Correction last year over 800 were Roman Catholics. Now,

the Roman Catholics are as one to seven of the whole population of this city. So one-eighth of the population furnishes over two-thirds of the criminals. Surely the people of the United States ought not to allow the youth of our land to be educated by this wholesale breeder of criminals.

Roman Catholics, I am your friend, and I exhort you, in the name of God, to forsake idolatrous Rome. I ask you, in the name of our crucified Saviour, to read the Bible, especially the New Testament. Read it continually, read it carefully, read it prayerfully, and you will find the truths of the Christian religion therein. "Search the Scriptures." These are the words of our Saviour himself. Do not be carried away any longer by the delusive mummeries of Rome. Read and find out for yourselves. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Whosoever will, let them come, and partake of the water of life." These also are the words of our Saviour. Rome teaches that he that believeth in the Roman Catholic Church and dies therein shall be saved, and that all others are damned. Which are you going to believe? Rome teaches that God and the priest are co-equal in the confessional. St. Paul says: "There is only one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." Which will you believe? Paul also says that in later times men shall arise speaking lies and hypocrisy, forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thankfulness; for every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the Word of

God and by prayer. (1 Tim 4: 1-5. Rome teaches that it is sinful to eat meat on Friday. The Bible says: "A bishop must be blameless and without reproach before the world, the husband of one wife, bringing up his children in the admonition and the fear of God." Rome teaches that her bishops and priests must not marry. Which will you believe?

My dear Catholic friends, read the Bible, and may God in His infinite mercy and goodness assist you, and bring you out from the darkness and superstition of Rome and lead you into the glorious light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Such is the earnest prayer of a converted Catholic.

TIM. REAGAN.

They Cried "Down With the Pope!"

The following dispatch was recently received from Rome: "When the results of the elections for municipal officers became known a crowd gathered in front of the residence of Prime Minister Crispi, the Liberal leader, who was one of the successful candidates, and gave him a grand reception. The crowd noisily celebrated the Liberal victory, and amid the cheers for the successful candidates could be heard cries of 'Long live Crispi!' 'Down with the Clericals!' 'Down with the Pope!' In response to repeated calls Signor Crispi appeared upon the balcony of the house and delivered a short address, in which he congratulated the people upon the victory won by the Liberals. His remarks were greeted with cheers. Afterward the crowd marched to the palace of the Propaganda, where a demonstration against the Clericals was made."

WHY I LEFT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY JOHN BOND.

I left the Roman Church because that Church does not rest upon the Word of the living God. Romanism rests upon tradition, which must needs be full of human errors. I cannot conceive that Christ trusted His Church to the laws and rules of tradition. He did not promise salvation to them that believe on tradition. He promised the eternal reward to them that believed on Him. I cannot conceive that Christ would make salvation depend upon the rules and the regulations and the traditions of men. Salvation comes through the heart, and the heart is touched only by the grace of God, and the grace of God comes only from God direct to man. As God has created me, so He can enlighten and save me without the consent of any man or any set of men. I must not suffer anything to stand between Christ and myself.

I left the Roman Church because her tradition is broken, corrupted and knowingly falsified. Rome's new dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility are proofs of this manufactured and distorted tradition. But tradition of any kind as an essential condition to obtaining eternal life is vicious in practise and absurd in theory. Who is to determine what is true and what is false tradition? The Church, or speaking more accurately, the Pope and the Jesuits have forged and invented documents. They have fabricated tradition. Testimonies of the early Church and even of monks in the days of scholastic speculation against the dogma of Immaculate Conception are numerous

and decisive. Not less plain are the proofs against the assertion that Papal infallibility can be sustained on traditional grounds. If we reject the Popes as the final judges of tradition there remains either the Church or the professors of ecclesiastical history. The Church (i. e.), the council of bishops has abdicated its right of judging of tradition to the infallible Popes. We must, therefore, look to the professors of ecclesiastical history. Let us push this doctrine of saving tradition to its last consequences. We find then that if we would be saved we must either become students of history ourselves or else take the word of a teacher of ecclesiastical history as the basis of our hope of salvation. I prefer with the Protestants—to rely on the revealed Word of God and on His infinite mercy and goodness. I prefer Jesus and His Gospel to the Pope and the bishops and to tradition and to the professors of ecclesiastical history.

I believe in tradition that tells me that there have been at all times since Christ came into the world good and honest Christians eager to serve God and to follow the paths of righteousness. I do not believe, however, that these Christians had more advantage before God than I have, nor do I believe that God made them instruments to transmit to future generations any rules of life or any doctrines or any precepts, without which salvation is incomplete or impossible. I believe in the teaching of the apostles as they are revealed in their written word. I cannot concede to any other force or power than to the Holy Word of God

the right to direct me and point out to me the way of salvation. I cannot believe that God should make use of a purely human and uncertain agency to perpetuate His Church on earth. I believe that His grace and His Word are sufficient to save mankind. Tradition is useful, interesting and edifying as history, but it is no more.

Rev. Father Young, formerly a Protestant and now a worshipper of Rome-made tradition, in an article in the June issue of the *Catholic World* predicts with desperate attempts at clownish humor and with infinite self-complacency the speedy downfall of Protestantism. Little exertion is needed to make such prophecies. Politicians make them by the dozen in every campaign. Unless Father Young gives us more satisfactory reasons for falling down and worshipping tradition by the grace of the Pope and the Jesuits than his own valuable opinion of the impending fall of Protestantism, I must respectfully ask him to employ his time more usefully. Protestantism, Father Young, is not of yesterday—indeed it is as old as those Eastern churches which parted from Rome mainly on traditional grounds. We know your fellow Romanists have for centuries been fond of foretelling the doom of these churches, and yet they live. They live and yet theirs is not a healthy life. The fatal blight of tradition worship has fallen on them and stunted their growth. I have more respect for their tradition, for although in principle it cannot be of any more intrinsic and saving value than any other, yet I do believe that the Greeks and the Syrians and the many other Eastern churches

have tried to preserve tradition in good faith and be guided by its lights. But Rome has not even done that. The Papal-pagan Cæsarism has manufactured and unblushingly falsified tradition.

I left the Roman Church because Romanism has everywhere retarded and impeded reasonable and honest human progress and civilization, while Protestantism has advanced and aided every healthy human aspiration. I did not come to this conclusion in the quiet of a study or through the reading of books alone.

I was born in a thoroughly Roman Catholic country. I have travelled over a considerable part of Europe and the United States. I state it as my experience that in Roman countries ignorance and superstition prevail to a very large extent. In Italy the percentage of illiterate persons is alarmingly great. Dishonorable poverty is the badge of the lower classes of Italians. By the side of proud marble churches with silver and gold and precious stones in countless shrines I found hordes of ragged miserable beggars. In Austria I found feudalism and mediæval institutions and ideas still very much alive. The vast empire is very slowly dying of decay, and the people, naturally bright and energetic, are superstitious, ignorant and immoral. Nowhere in the world is the number of illegitimate children as great as in Austria and Bavaria. A contributor to the June issue of the *Catholic World* says that this signifies little, because the majority of Austrians, and especially the Viennese, are but nominal Catholics. If I be permitted to digress for a moment I want to say that I have never seen a more terrible arraignment of

the Roman Church than is contained in these words. He says the shocking immorality of Austrians means little or nothing because Austrians and Viennese are only nominal Catholics. I respectfully and *sine ira et studio* ask the editor of the *Catholic World* to explain this more fully. If there has ever been a country in the world where Romanism has had a magnificent field for testing its system of ethics and proving its efficiency as a moral teacher, the Empire of Austria was that field. With but one exception the children of the house of Hapsburg have been the devoted servants of Rome. Joseph II., although emperor, was unable to fight successfully against that Church, so strongly had she entrenched herself during his predecessors. In every valley of the empire, along the Danube and the Moldow, on the mountains of the Tyrol, in the populous cities of Lower Austria, in the fertile regions of Hungary, everywhere convents and Romish schools abound. For centuries Rome has controlled the schools of the empire. Her religious orders have been the pets of every sovereign that sat on the throne of Rudolph. In the city of Vienna the number of Catholic schools is legion; in every part of the great city we see Catholic domes and churches and convents, and we cannot pass a street without meeting a hooded Capuchin or a Redemptorist with his string of rosary beads. And yet the *Catholic World* tells us that Catholicism in Austria is a failure. If it is a fiasco after a trial of centuries in Austria, why are we asked to believe it will be a wonderful success in America? What is true of Austria is true of every other Romanist country in the world. Crime and

poverty are the inseparable concomitants of the Roman system. Compare the criminal statistics of pontifical Rome with Italian Rome. Compare the North with the South of Germany. Compare the Bretagne and Vendome with the rest of France. Compare Ireland with England. I must not dwell on this point too long. No Catholic controversialist has yet been found who feels inclined to discuss this subject.

I left the Roman Church because that Church deceived me in many important matters. When I was a boy the priest told me that Luther was an apostate monk, who left Rome because he wanted to get married. I know this is not true. I know that Luther was a whole-souled, pure hearted man, whose sturdy honesty rebelled against the snaky tricks of Rome. I know, moreover, that there was no special meeting of demons at his death bed, and that he was not dragged to hell with red hot iron hooks, as was told us in our Catholic parochial school. I know that not only Luther, but Calvin, Zwingle, Knox, Melancthon, were all good, honest Christians, liable to err like all of us, but full of zeal for a pure worship of God, and entirely unlike some Popes, who, I was taught, were infallible successors of St. Peter and the earthly representatives of Christ himself.

I left the Roman Church because, having been brought up by a good and loving mother, I have a profound respect for womanhood. I compared the position of woman in Catholic countries with that in Protestant countries. In England and America woman is respected and laws are made to protect her rights, and customs are in

vogue to encourage her virtue and the cultivation of womanly graces. In Roman Catholic countries woman has but little rights and enjoys but a small measure of respect. Wife beating in Roman countries is encouraged by that latest doctor of the Church, St. Alphonsus de Liguori, who tells husbands, when they examine their conscience for confession, that they may chastise their wives, but counsels them at the same time to use moderation and not beat their wives too severely. A girl that is betrayed under promise of marriage in a Roman country has no means of redress against her betrayer. I cannot repeat in these pages the coarse and indecent language in which I have heard priests and monks defend the principle that when a woman goes wrong she is alone to blame. A Church which regards celibacy as the more perfect state for either man or woman has not the right idea of Christian marriage. Maudlin and senseless love making to the Virgin Mary by monks and priests on the one hand and a prejudice against all women on the other hand is not apt to impress one favorably. I have read what Liguori says in his "Moral Theology" about the sixth commandment, and I have also read the statements of his great French biographer in regard to the saint's early youth, and I am unable to reconcile either with Liguori's profession of purity and his celibacy. That is not a sound morality which regards women, no matter how pure and good, as dangerous; and yet this is the morality of Rome as expressed in the innumerable devotional and ascetic books in the convents. Why should a Christian and a gentleman not be allowed to speak with a

woman except through an iron grating and with face averted?

I left the Roman Church because she mocks the Christian precept which commands us to love one another. Toleration, patience and charity are truly Christian qualities. To destroy those who do not believe as we do is Mohamedan doctrine, but it is not the teaching of Christ.

I left the Roman Church because its head, the Pope, is continually striving after temporal power contrary to the Spirit of Christ, who said, "My kingdom is not of this world."

I left the Roman Church because she does not preach the Gospel. In her vast devotional library and her spiritual literature I do not find that the Bible occupies a prominent place. The lives and writings of saints replace the Word of God.

I left the Roman Church because she is the uncompromising foe of popular education. She cares very little about giving the children that knowledge to which they are entitled, but she cares very much about creating in impressionable minds a blind attachment to Rome and an unreasoning hatred of non-Catholics. She deliberately keeps her children in ignorance and then fills them with that vanity which is the greatest bar to enlightenment.

I left the Roman Church because I have seen her with all her blotches and deformities in countries where she may fearlessly show her true character and unfold her full power. In America she seeks to paint those blotches and hide those deformities, and many are thereby deceived.

I left the Roman Church because she has obscured and desecrated true

Christian doctrine. She favors and advocates the veneration of relics, the invocation of saints, the praying of the so-called rosary and the Papal grant of absolution of sins, called indulgences. She has introduced many strange and semi-blasphemous forms of appealing to Christ for the forgiveness of sin—such as devotion to the sacred hearts of St. Mary and St. Joseph, the attribution of special saving or miraculous powers to certain images and relics. I am willing to turn Romanist again if the slightest semblance of warrant for these things can be shown to me either in the Word of God or in the teachings and commentaries of the apostolic age. What would Christ have said to the man He should have found telling his beads or kissing even a genuine bone of St. Anne? What would He have said to the sinner who should have sought pardon through a novena in honor of the sacred heart of St. Joseph?

I left the Roman Church because within that Church there is neither hope nor possibility of reform. To keep the masses in ignorance and to rule through the masses is the great object of the Roman Church. With that plan of policy reform is incompatible. Reform has sometimes been forced on the Church, but the old lust of power, the domineering force of Rome, soon shook off every reform which public opinion had compelled her to affect for a time and for a purpose. Every effort at reform has been steadily suppressed as soon as any of the vitals of Romanism were touched. Savonarola's fate is in an instance to the point. The Reformed Catholic movement in Germany in the early part of this century, led by such men

as Wessenberg and Dahlberg, may also be mentioned, and likewise the al-simultaneous movement in Switzerland led by Helbling and Fuchs. There is no compromise with Rome. To become a Christian one must leave Rome. There is no other way.

I left the Roman Church because she is the mother of lies. There is no crime in her history which her apologists do not either boldly defend or sophistically explain away. Neither the fearful murders of the Inquisition nor the massacre of St. Bartholomew appal the genuine Romanist. He will deny, evade and prevaricate in all manner of ways, but he will never confess that his Church was guilty. Her too beautiful explanations and her too numerous proofs for anything and everything have helped to drive me out of her pale.

I left the Roman Church because she is no friend of the family, while the Protestant Church honors and in every way encourages Christian family life. The Roman Church proclaims it a meritorious thing for children to run away from their parents and become inmates of convents and religious institutions. There are Romish religious orders which forbid the son and the daughter to see and speak to the father and the mother, and who do not permit the son to go to the death bed of his mother, except in very rare instances, and then under humiliating and cruel conditions. I have seen a mother beat her head against the iron grating of the convent gate in a vain attempt to get in, while her son, surrounded in his cell by priests and monks, was breathing his last.

I left the Roman Church because she is full of deceit and duplicity. She

pretends to be in this country the foe of the liquor traffic and its numerous evil consequences. In the Plenary Council of Baltimore she admonishes liquor dealers to give up their trade and seek a more decent way of making a livelihood.

At many missions she has special preachers on temperance. On the other hand her "Sisters" solicit alms in rum shops. Her churches and her seminaries are built with the help of the money that was passed over the bar in exchange for whiskey and beer. There is not a Roman Catholic seminary in the country in which you cannot find at least one son of a liquor seller, and generally you find very many more. They acquire the knowledge of Roman proselytism with the help of those dollars that were spent for rum when they should have been spent for the wife and the children.

The city in which I live has a strong Roman Catholic population. The Romanists were building a church in a new section of the city, and as they needed money they decided to hold a fair, and of course they got up a programme. More than forty per cent. of the advertisements in that Roman Catholic programme came from rum-sellers who were, of course, good Catholics and friends of the priest. What would they say if the pastor of the church next Sunday took for his text the admonition of the Third Plenary Council and asked them to go into better business.

They would certainly call the priest an ingrate and the Church a hypocritical institution, and they would be right. The temperance professions and sermons of the Romanists

are intended for the consumption of simple-minded American Protestants.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

A War on Secret Orders.

We quote the following from the Boston *British American Citizen*, August 6, 1892 :

"A telegram to the dailies of Fort Dodge, Iowa, says : 'Whether to forsake allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church or to the order of Knights of Pythias, is a question that is troubling about one-third of the active members of the Knights of Pythias Lodge here. The same question will have to be decided by Catholic Knights all over the State. In response to a personal letter from L. F. Gemmett, the two Iowa Catholic prelates, Bishops Cosgrove and Hennessy, have written letters declaring that the Knights of Pythias Order is condemned by the Church in common with all secret societies. They say that no Catholic should be allowed to join the order. The penalty for doing so or maintaining membership is excommunication. The Catholic Knights here say that they joined the order after consulting their pastor, who, on investigation, found that Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, and Bishop Marty, of Sioux Falls, expressed their judgment that it was not prohibited. He assured the prospective Knights they need fear no opposition while such eminent Church dignitaries gave their approval.'

"Poor fellows ! They are not Americans enough to declare their independence of priestly tyranny, but will continue to be led about tied to their masters' apron-strings."

RECENT ROMAN PERSECUTION IN IRELAND.

[From the "London Christian."]

THE relentless persecution endured by Father Connellan's family and friends in the west of Ireland reads like a chapter from the annals of the Inquisition. It will be remembered that Mr. Connellan was a well-known priest of the Church of Rome. He left it from conscientious motives, and for three years has been living as an evangelist among Roman Catholics. Because his father refused to turn him out of his house the parish priest waited on his workmen and ordered them to boycott him. One of them, who had worked for Mr. Connellan for eight years, has, with his wife and family, been refused the sacraments because he refused to boycott his old master. The blacksmith was obliged to refuse to shoe Mr. Connellan's horses, as he had two sisters teaching in national schools, over which the parish priest was manager. The hotel proprietor in the town of Boyle, from which Mr. Connellan used to hire post cars, was compelled by the priests to write declining to serve him any more.

A sister of Father Connellan's is proprietor of the Commercial Hotel, Sligo. A strict watch is kept upon the place, and every Roman Catholic who enters the house is reprimanded by the priests, and warned that he will be refused the sacraments of his Church if he offends again.

Mr. Connellan was recently in Sligo, and several Roman Catholics called to see him and converse with him on religious matters. The priests afterwards waited upon each individual, used most threatening language unless they promised to go back to Rome, and

announced that their names would be read from the altar.

The Roman Catholic administrator of Sligo ordered the people from the pulpit to hit in the face any person who offered them tracts, pamphlets or any works not approved of by the Church of Rome. At a meeting of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, on a recent Sunday, the same gentleman asked his hearers to have no dealings with a local bank, because the wife of one of the officials was guilty of the high crime of speaking about Christ to her Roman Catholic servant. In order to afford his hearers a good example he assured them that unless the obnoxious official was removed the bishop and the nuns would withdraw their accounts from the bank alluded to.

The above facts, and many equally significant, are all public property here, yet certain good people in England inform us that we enjoy religious equality. Lord Archibald Douglas leaves the Church of his fathers to join the creed of Rome. He goes about with a missionary van in the south of Scotland, where nine tenths of the people are Presbyterians, yet no one molests or insults him. Father Connellan elects to cast off the vestment of a sacrificing priest and become an evangelist in the cause of Bible Christianity. For this crime his late bishop, Dr. Gillooly, of Sligo, excommunicates him, forbids the people to speak to him, to stretch out a helping hand if he were drowning, or offer him a crumb of bread if he were starving. Nay, the ban embraces all the members of the family. Even though they are Roman Catholics they must be made an example of, lest any other priest should dare to follow suit.

MONTHLY RECORD OF ROMAN CATHOLIC EVENTS.

A French Canadian Roman Catholic convention has been recently held in Great Falls, N. H. Father Chagnon made a long speech on the school question, and said in the course of his remarks: "In this country we must fight against the public schools; this is why the parents must help the [Roman] clergy."

**

The *Freeman's Journal* of July 16, 1892, contains the letter of the Pope to the bishop of Grenoble in France concerning the policy of conciliation toward the French Republic. Leo XIII. says, among other things: "When politics become closely allied to religious interests, as they are at present actually in France, if it is the duty of any party to determine the beneficial management which tends to be the safeguard of religious interests, pertaining to the supreme end of all, *that duty belongs to the Pontiff of Rome.*" This applies, of course, to Roman Catholics all over the world.

**

The same paper in its issue of July 2, 1892, thus appreciates the campaign of Rev. Thomas Dixon against municipal misrule and mismanagement:

"Rev. Thomas Dixon, Jr., one of the sensational preachers of the day in New York, who vies with Dr. Parkhurst in notriety-seeking, says he is 'willing to serve God in the penitentiary as well as in the pulpit,' and in order to attain his end has undertaken to libel our city officials. The latter may deserve all that is said of them, but inasmuch as Dr. Dixon's grievance against them is more on account of the nationality from which they sprung

than because of anything they have done, and as we incline to the belief that the reverend gentleman is tainted by a mean bigotry that takes advantage of everything to defame Catholics and their Church, we can't say we should be sorry if some of those whom he has undertaken to blackguard succeeded in landing him behind the bars. Such men make a circus of Christian churches and a travesty of religion."

Alas! Rum, Romanism, Rebellion and Rotteness!

**

In an interview published in the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, July 15, 1892, Archbishop Ireland claimed that the Faribault and Stillwater plan "may be adopted in any other case where the same circumstances exist." He said: "In any parish where the parochial schools labor under the same difficulties that were encountered in those parishes, the same arrangement may be made." Being asked what he thought about the letter of Father Zimmerman of Freiburg, one of the leading theologians of Germany, concerning Cahenslyism, the Archbishop replied, "Zimmerman is a fool." Things are getting serious when bishops and priests treat each other in such a way and neglect, as their custom is, to hide from the public gaze their quarrels, animosities and differences of opinion.

**

The Roman Catholic *Moniteur du Commerce* of Montreal closes an article on the exodus of French Canadian families from the country districts to the cities and the United States with

following remarks: "According to us there is one only case for these two currents of emigration—ignorance. This ignorance is to be attributed to those who, for many years, have dealt with farmers simply to make capital out of them for clerical or political ends. Now ignorance begets laziness, laziness begets misery, and misery begets emigration to the United States and elsewhere."

Who is responsible for that ignorance? Rome, who has, for over 250 years, had full power over the French in America.

At the consecration of Bishop Michaud of Burlington, Vt., the sermon was preached by Father Beaven of Holyoke, Mass. I take from the *Travailleur* of July 8, 1892, the following extract:

"Must I tell you that the priest is a heavenly ambassador, bringing to man the fruits of redemption, the vicergerent of Christ upon earth? Do I need to say that the power of consecrating and of absolving exalts the ministers of Christ to such heights that the very angels are jealous? Do I need to say that these sacred functions make them really participate in the priesthood of Christ? I say all that, and much more of the episcopate, when I proclaim with the councils of the Church that it is the only state of sacerdotal perfection."

Thus Roman Catholics are taught, blinded and enslaved at the feet of their hierarchy.

The Roman Catholic papers are elated over the success of Father Phillips in stopping a prize fight at Wilkesbarre, Pa., which had attracted

there "the usual tough element." Good for the priest. But the worst of it is that the crowd dispersed by him was composed almost exclusively of Roman Catholics—nominally so or otherwise. Hence what speaks well for the priest is a bad showing for his people.

Cardinal Gibbons and other dignitaries declare that the talked-of reproduction of the Passion Play at the World's Fair would be sacrilegious, as it can be given only at Ober-Ammergau as a local and historical custom. True. But then, how is it that at St. Mary's Mission, in Montana, a Passion Play was given by the Indians in the presence of a large number of bishops and priests, a full account of which is given in the *Helena Independent*, June 26? It was so realistic that "a waxed image of the Saviour was nailed to a cross, and clinging to the feet of the crucified, and receiving the drops of blood on her head, was Mary Magdalene, whose long jet black hair streamed below her waist."

The mischievous Stillwater experiment is already bearing fruit as shown in the *Northwestern Congregationalist*, July 1, 1892:

"It is reported on good authority that recently the Protestant children attending St. Michael's school at Stillwater, the one whose transformation into a 'public' school has caused so much discussion, were taken to the Roman Catholic church and sprinkled with holy water to prevent their taking diphtheria. Water, 'holy' or otherwise, is an effective agent in promoting bodily health, but we think this is the first instance of its application by a public school teacher for the purpose

named." That is Rome's way.

The French Liberal press of Canada has entered upon a remarkable and timely campaign against the privileges of Roman Catholic institutions which do not pay taxes. They claim that if the Province of Quebec is threatened with bankruptcy the clergy, who claim to be so patriotic, should come to the rescue and disgorge a small portion of their millions. In Montreal alone the Sulpicians and the Sisters of Charity are several times millionaires, not to speak of other institutions.

The *Echo* says, among other things: "In spite of their gigantic fortune the Grey Nuns (or Sisters of Charity) do not pay a cent of taxes, and at the same time the poor families bleed themselves and work like beasts of burden so as to earn enough money to feed their children and pay taxes." A few Conservative papers have also endorsed the movement which sprang up entirely among Roman Catholics.

According to the leading Roman Catholic organ of Italy, outside of Rome, the *Osservatore Romano*, the eminent prelate, Mgr. Baumgarten, has been guilty of "a most atrocious slander." So says the *Freeman's Journal*, July 4, 1892, republishing the following taken from the *Boston Pilot*, which, in turn, quotes from the *Osservatore* :

"It is said that Mgr. Baumgarten, who last year made a journey through America, busies himself now in spreading calumnies and misrepresentations against America; all of which is so far from the truth that we must set down to the same mark the whole of what is attributed to Mgr. Ireland. Mgr.

Baumgarten has great admiration for all that is good in America, but he certainly could not be expected to approve that Irish priests play cards and drink instead of attending to their parishes."

Mgr. Baumgarten is both a shrewd observer and a courageous man for thus disclosing what almost everybody knows, but does not dare to mention.

The *Catholic Review*, July 16, 1892, says: "Our religion teaches us to love our Protestant neighbors and to do them all the good in our power. We must hate their errors but love them. Our dislike, therefore, must be for the false doctrine only, but not for the persons who hold it. That distinction is clear." This is lying with a vengeance. J. A. D.

Neither Corrigan nor Ireland.

The correspondent of the *London Chronicle* at Rome says: "The Pope's desire to make an American cardinal at the next consistory has been frustrated by the divergence of views of Archbishops Corrigan and Ireland. The Pope has resolved to appoint the Most Rev. Charles John Vaughan, archbishop of Westminster, to the cardinalate at the earliest opportunity."

A special dispatch from Paris to the *Chronicle* says that Mgr. Stoner will also be made a cardinal at the coming Papal consistory. Mgr. Stoner is an uncle of Lord Camoys, and has long been a representative of the aristocratic English Catholics at Rome. After Cardinal Manning's death it was thought by many persons that Mgr. Stoner would succeed him, but in this they were disappointed.

WAS THE APOSTLE PETER EVER AT ROME?

BY REV. MASON GALLAGHER, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

[The first two chapters of this inquiry, previously printed in 1884 in *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, are now reproduced, revised and enlarged previous to publication in book form.]

THE conclusion which follows from the fact of St. Peter being Bishop of Rome is important and one which every Catholic looks upon as the foundation of his faith." (Rev. S. B. Smith's, D. D., "Teachings of the Holy Catholic Church." Imprimatur: Cardinals McCloskey and Gibbons; Bishops Gilmour, Lynch and Elder. 1884.)

"The simplest way of proving that the Bishop of Rome is not the successor of St. Peter is by establishing as a stubborn fact that St. Peter himself, the presumed source of the Roman claims, never was Bishop of Rome; in fact that he never was in the Eternal City." (Rev. Reuben Parsons, D. D., "Studies in Church History." Imprimatur: Archbishop Corrigan, New York. 1886.)

* CHAPTER I.

Considering the generally accepted opinion on this question, it is remarkable that the weight of modern argument is so largely with those who deny that there is satisfactory or respectable evidence that the Apostle Peter ever resided in or visited the Imperial City; evidence based on testimony *judicially scrutinized*; which alone is worthy to be accepted in an investigation so important with respect to the spiritual, eternal interests involved.

For if Peter went to Rome, and the results followed, which over half the visible Christian Church are taught to believe as an essential article of faith, then the writer, and all who with him reject and oppose the Roman Catholic

Church, because not a sound and pure part of the kingdom of Christ, are thereby doomed to eternal and irretrievable damnation with the devil and his angels.

I am aware that the Roman claim of the Primacy of Peter would not be established by such a visit, nor by an asserted residence of twenty five years in that city. I insist, also, that the burden of proof in this matter rests with those who make the eternal salvation of mankind depend upon their belief in Peter as living and ruling in Rome as supreme Bishop of the Christian Church.

For it is absolutely essential for the confirmation of Roman Catholic claims that Peter should have lived in Rome; should have been Bishop of Rome; should have handed down plenary apostolic power to his supposed successors. The whole fabric of the Roman edifice needs for its support the production of well authenticated and indisputable testimony to establish Peter's visit to and residence in Rome.

Cardinal Perrone, one of the most learned of recent Roman controversialists, in a work published in 1864, says: "None but an apostate Catholic could assert that Peter was not at Rome; for the reason of that fact is that the coming of St. Peter at Rome and the seat there established by him is connected with an article of our faith—that is, the primacy of Order and Jurisdiction belonging of divine right to the Roman Pontiff. Hence it

follows that he cannot be a Catholic who does not believe the coming, the episcopate, and the death of St. Peter in Rome." Cardinal Bellarmine acknowledges that "the right of succession of the Popes is founded on this, that Peter established his seat in Rome by divine command, and occupied it till his death."

It overthrows the foundations of the Church of Rome to show that there is no clear or reliable proof that Peter visited Rome; because the whole scheme of Popery falls without the establishment of this assumption. It is as essential to this argument as the brain or the heart is to the human body.

This whole subject has received of late years a more thorough investigation on the part of legal minds accustomed to sift evidence; and it has been clearly shown *that there is not a tradition of the first century after Peter's death that he was in Rome; and that there is no assertion of the fact till the beginning of the third century in any authentic document.*

That Holy Scripture makes no such statement is conceded by all, except those who unwarrantably assume that the Apostle, when he writes Babylon, means Rome, a position denied by many eminent Romanists, and by the great bulk of scholars outside that Church, of which the proof will be presented.

The Anglican Reformers, Cranmer, Hooper, Coverdale and others, assert that the proof is not clear for Peter's visit. Bradford argues strongly against it, so also does the Rev. Dr. Willet in the reign of Elizabeth in his "Synopsis Papismi." Of writers on the continent of eminent learning we have Spanheim, Salmasius and Basnage

on the negative side of this question.

In a treatise on the "Feigned Departure of Peter, etc.," Spanheim maintains that "Peter never was in Rome."

Salmasius asserts that "there is no better evidence for Peter having gone thither than for the preaching of James in Spain, or of Joseph of Arimathea in Britain; and by calculation of dates it is proved, with the utmost certainty, "that the Apostle was never at Rome." (See Robins' "Evidence of Scripture Against the Claims of the Roman Church," p. 106.)

Scaliger remarks: "As to Peter having gone to Rome, and having been put to death there, there is no person with the least education that can believe such a story."

Ranke affirms: "Historical criticism has shown that it is a matter of doubt whether the Apostle ever was at Rome at all." (Ref. C. II. ch. 3, p. 472.)

Of modern writers of great learning we have Adam Clarke, who asserts: "I am of opinion that St. Peter did not write from Rome—that he was neither Bishop of Rome nor martyred at Rome—in a word, that he never was at Rome."

Dr. Kitto says in his Encyclopædia: "There is no sufficient reason for believing that Peter was ever even so much as within the walls of Rome."

Rev. Dr. Moore, in the *Southern Methodist Review*, writes: "The fact that we press is, that there is not a particle of evidence for 100 years after the death of Peter that it was ever dreamed that he had been in Rome; that it is not until A. D. 176 that a doubtful testimony occurs, and that it is not until the first quarter of the third century that we find clear

evidence that this fact was believed, and then only in connection with many admitted falsehoods. There is absolutely no clear satisfactory proof that Peter ever was at Rome; the probability clearly is that he died at Babylon." (January 1856)

Professor Clement M. Butler, formerly a chaplain in Rome, remarks in his work, "St. Paul in Rome," p. 260: "We find no contemporaneous witness saying that St. Peter was at Rome, nor even *saying that it was said*. We find no witnesses *near that period* making the assertion. It is not until several generations after his death that it began to be said that St. Peter had lived and been crucified at Rome. After it once began to be said it matters not how many may have repeated the saying on the authority of those who went before. They do not add any strength to the testimony. The chain of testimony fails for the want of connecting links between the first witnesses and the facts alleged. Nothing is accomplished by adding a thousand links to the other end of the chain."

We see from an examination of those references which we have considered of how little weight, in the way of historical testimony, would be the statements of Eusebius and Jerome, and twenty or thirty other fathers who lived from a century and a half to four centuries after Peter, as to the question of his residence, his life and death at Rome. They could but repeat the statements of those who had gone before. They could but assert over and over that such and such were traditions of the Church. How much credit would be due to traditions thus created we have already seen. For it would not be difficult to show that

whatever weight may be due to that which may be called traditions, the alleged statements with regard to St. Peter are not in fact entitled to that name." (See Hodge's Theology, p. 132; G. S. Faber's Tract on Popery, p. 59; John Owen's Works.)

ROMAN CATHOLIC ADMISSIONS.

A marked feature of this controversy is the character of the admissions made by Roman Catholic writers. Simon in his "Mission and Martyrdom of St. Peter" refers to some of these admissions. Introd. p. 10:

"Charles Du Moulin, the great ecclesiastical lawyer (A. D. 1566), whom Father Calmet speaks of as a steadfast Roman Catholic, and than whom no writer ever enjoyed a higher reputation for learning and intelligence, has unequivocally stated it as his opinion that there never was even a vague tradition among the ancients about Peter's having left the East, and that one might very well be a Roman Catholic without thinking there was."

In one passage he writes thus: "Even when after the breaking up of the empire the bishops of Rome began to extend their authority over other churches, they never alleged or put forward this story of Peter's being at Rome and of his primacy devolving in succession upon them, which they would not have omitted to do if there had been any such thing to put forward; a clear proof that there was not; the story, I suppose, not having yet been invented." (Vol. IV., p. 460.)

Father Leland, the celebrated English antiquarian (A. D. 1552), and Marsilius, a distinguished Italian jurist (A. D. 1324), both of whom Calmet also mentions as members of his church, were equally positive on this point.

Father Caron, an Irish Franciscan of the highest eminence (A. D. 1666), took the same view of the matter ; as also did Father Hardouin, a French Jesuit (A. D. 1729), likewise in very high repute in Rome. "We Roman Catholics hold," says Father Hardouin, "that at least Peter's head was brought to Rome after his crucifixion, and that it ought to be duly worshipped there ; but that the Pope is Christ's substitute and Peter's successor, is clear enough without our being bound to suppose that Peter himself ever came to Rome."

I would not extend this article, but having all the Greek and Latin passages before me ever alleged as testimony of St. Peter's having left the East, thirty seven in number, I am prepared to show that all combined do not present satisfactory or decisive proof that this Apostle ever visited Rome.

Indeed the case resembles that of the story of the female Pope Joan, which, although accepted by one Pope and 150 Romish writers, and sustained by monuments prior to A. D. 1600, is yet rejected by numerous Protestant writers. It requires no more credulity to believe the one than the other. There is about as much certainty that the one was Pope as that the other ever visited Rome. It is equally idle to base any matter of importance, any scheme of doctrine, on the supposition that either event ever transpired. The errors and delusions of the Papal scheme are built, like the story of Peter's Roman visit, on traditions suited to superstitious minds, not on reason or fair argument, which will abide the test of sound criticism and candid and thorough examination.

The rejoinder that Protestants of eminent reputations like Bishop Pearson, the youthful prodigy Baratier, and Dr. N. Lardner, have accepted the tradition of Peter's visit and residence in Rome as a fact is conclusively met by its utter rejection by numerous writers of equal learning and influence, as we shall fully show. Bishop Bull, a contemporary and scholar of like fame with Pearson, writes: "Some very learned men have observed that the above tradition of St. Peter's voyage to Rome was first derived from Papias, an author indeed very ancient, but also very credulous and of a mean judgment." (Vindication of the Church of England, p. 42.)

A claim which involves consequences so momentous demands of necessity proof, clear, positive, impregnable.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Rome Again Defeated.

The following appeared in the New York *Catholic Herald*, August 13, 1892: "There is considerable excitement among Roman Catholics over the judgment of the Manitoba school case by the Imperial Privy Council, the highest court in the British Empire. British cablegrams indicate that the decision overrules the judgment of the Dominion Supreme Court and maintained the constitutionality of the act passed by the Manitoba Legislature abolishing Catholic separate schools in that province. A test case resulted in the refusal of the Winnipeg Catholics to pay taxes in support of the public schools. The Catholics won in all the inferior courts until they reached the Privy Council."

THE INQUISITION AN AWFUL REALITY.

FROM THE TESTIMONY OF ROMAN CATHOLIC WRITERS

BY REV. W. R. GORDON, S. T. D.

II.

THE use of the "infernal adjective" is naturally repulsive, but long since has been adjudged by intelligent non-Catholics as most appropriately descriptive of the most horrible institution that ever disgraced the world; it was thought beyond the contrivance of human malignity. The reason is obvious. The shortest story of its unheard of cruelties, so blood-curdling to any auditor, always seems incredible, and no man worthy of the name can be brought to believe it, until forced to the admission by the continuous maledictions and execrations of indisputable history, enforced by the ocular demonstrations of travellers who, like the present writer, have seen with their own eyes, and handled with their own hands, the accursed instruments of Inquisitorial torture gathered into a private unlabelled room of some European museum.

Hence when the history of these cruelties began to spread abroad in our country, the awakened indignation of its people created necessity to contradict it by some means that might serve to remove all odium from the Roman Catholic Church, made responsible for the devilry by records of many portions of the world where Romanism had gained ascendancy. Priests occasionally found it expedient to come out in the papers with all the assumed vociferation of injured innocence, either to deny the existence of the Inquisition altogether, or to maintain as best they could that their Church was responsible for any of its acts; and this

has been their policy down to the present time. Thus in January of 1832 a controversy on this subject arose between a writer at Washington in the *National Intelligencer* and the *Philadelphia Gazette*.

The former, by the way of extenuation, asserted that "many speak about the Inquisition beguiled either by false accounts or the prejudice of others. They do not know that the institution never condemned a man to death, and that the population of those countries who possessed this establishment never emigrated to escape its jurisdiction; and further, the Inquisition was simply a court of enquiry, whose motto was '*Misericordia et Justitia.*'" !

The *Gazette*, after expressing the greatest surprise at this notoriously false assertion, thus sharply responded:

"We did not think that any man in this country, in these times, could believe; or believing, that any man in this country could utter; or uttering, that any journal in this country could consent to publish anything in favor of the Inquisition. As, however, the declaration has been made—as such sentiments, we blush to say, have gone forth—we will bring some reminiscences of the Inquisition to test the truth of the writer in question, and we refer to the work of Llorente, Secretary of the Inquisition at Spain, who has published a critical history of the Inquisition from its establishment by Ferdinand V., to the reign of Ferdinand VII."

The present writer has a copy of

this work, and can certify to the accuracy of the references made and the truth of the assertion in reply to the mendacious Jesuit.

"Llorente first examines what were the principles adopted by the Catholic Church for the discovery and punishment of heretics before the Inquisition, as such, was formally established. The recital of the facts alone establishes the most evident contrast between the benignant charity of these days and the inhuman ferocity of the age of fanaticism.

"The author then conducts us to the bloody cradle of the Inquisition in the midst of the Gauls of Narbonne at the time of the persecutions and the massacre of the Albigenses. He follows the progress of this formidable institution in Italy and Spain. We perceive it gradually gaining strength, notwithstanding the stubborn resistance of all the provinces of Arragon.

"The history displays the government of the *ancient* Inquisition; the strange proceedings of its tribunals; the nature of the punishment and of the penances it used to inflict upon its victims: then the establishment of the *modern* Inquisition, when Ferdinand and Isabella reigned in Castile—the violence of its first acts; the expulsion of the Jews; the persecution of the Moors and of the descendants of both.

"Sylla, Marius, the Triumvirs, and the cruellest of the Roman emperors might be considered moderate men when compared to that grand Inquisitor—that terrible *Torquemada*, whose name is written in bloody characters in the annals of nations. During the eighteen years of his Inquisitorial ministry 10,220 unfortunate beings perished in the flames; 6,800 were

burnt in effigy; 87,000 were condemned to infamy in the loss of property and perpetual imprisonment; and the banishments, ordained by a false policy and zeal, deprived Spain during that same period of many millions of inhabitants.

"The reader will be convinced on examining this faithful and deplorable description that Pope Sixtus IV. favored this Inquisition to the end of extending his own dominion; that Charles V. protected it with the hope of preventing Luther's opinions from penetrating into Spain; and that his successors respected it—some from superstition, others from weakness.

"The work of Llorente terminates by a very curious chronological epitome or recapitulation of the general principles of the holy office, and by a long enumeration of the sacred authorities, which prove how opposite to the spirit of the Scriptures and to the Christian religion were the maxims and acts of the Inquisition.

"The list of the victims of the Inquisition since 1481, made year after year and from official sources, sums up a total of 31,912 actually burnt; 17,159 burnt in effigy, and 201,450 condemned to severe sufferings; to which must be added 12,000,000 of souls lost to Spain by self-exilement, and the banishment of the Moors. (*All the inquisitors were ecclesiastics.*)

"The author does not include the colonies in this calculation. Could there be a stronger and more dreadful indictment than this result?"

How evident is the proof of the "*Misericordia et Justitia*" of the Inquisition as asserted by the aforesaid brazen liar! It is needless to say that the Philadelphia *Gazette* silenced the

contemptible Jesuit. Who, in this matter, so competent to speak the truth as D. Juan Antonio Llorente, formerly Secretary of the Inquisition, Chancellor of the University of Toledo Knight of the Order of Charles III., etc., etc.?

Again, in the early part of the same year 1832, the Deputy General of the American (not native) Jesuits harangued the people of Warrenton, North Carolina, and said, "The Inquisition was not an ecclesiastical establishment, but a contrivance of civil governors."!! The utterance was grossly absurd, and the speaker well knew it at the time; yet he had the hardihood to venture it before an American audience.

Such is the coolness of Jesuitism. The Romish decretals expressly "prohibit all governments from opposing the business of the Inquisition or hindering the execution of judgment and sentences of Inquisitors, declaring such to be smitten with the sword of excommunication, under the penalty of being treated as heretics." As the decretals are authoritative, and every Roman priest swears to uphold them, there is not one who is ignorant of the fact that the Inquisition is an institution of Romanism; and these Jesuitical denials must be met with overwhelming evidence of deliberate falsehood, drawn not only from history, but from the books of instruction having the authority of the Roman Church herself.

There is a volume entitled "Directorium Inquisitorium," first published at Rome, October 1584. This *Directorium for the Inquisitors* contains three parts. The first sets forth the authority of the Pope, as having at his

command two swords, the temporal and the spiritual, signifying a sort of omnipotence over all men and human affairs; so that while all are subject to his judgment he is subject to none. The second relates to heretics and their treatment. The third contains a great number of questions pertaining to the conduct of Inquisitors in the execution of their horrible duties; and bulls of Popes, the contents of which prove that each in his turn is the controlling power of the Inquisition for the destruction of heresy and heretics. Many who have written histories of this nefarious institution have rolled up heaps of evidence that defy the contradictions, perversions and prevarications of all the Jesuits in existence.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

No Longer a Nun.

Recently, in St. Louis, Miss Elsie Clemens was married to Lieutenant Powhatan Clarke. About six months ago Miss Clemens, one of the heirs to the great Willoughby estate, took the veil at Visitation Convent. It was a big social event at the time. Three months later she renounced her religious vows, and re entering the world, her engagement to Lieutenant Clarke, of the United States Army, was announced. Clarke was in the Apache war, and later he was sent to serve with the Imperial Hussars of Germany for two years for instruction. The couple are now in Europe.

...
Packages of tracts that are good for Protestants, Roman Catholics and all other good citizens will be sent to any address if postage stamps to cover expenses be enclosed with orders. Copies of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC will also be sent for free distribution where they will do good. The expenses connected with this work of distribution can be shared by all who read this notice.

SACERDOTAL ARROGANCE.

BY REV. H. R. PRATT, D. D.

I translate the following from *El Faro* of May 15, a paper published in the City of Mexico, and ask the attention of the Christian people of America to the language used by this dignitary of the Roman Church in the United States.

"Some two weeks or so ago the Rev. Dr. Horstman was consecrated bishop of the diocese of Cleveland. This was a great event in Roman Catholic circles in that city. Archbishop Ryan preached the sermon. It would have been supposed that such a man as he would speak modestly; but it did not so happen. Thus speaking of apostolic succession as producing certitude of faith, he said:

"Let us suppose that the two great apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, the patron saints of this cathedral, should descend from heaven, and appearing upon the cupola which is above our heads, surrounded by a company of angels, should declare to me emphatically that the Roman Catholic Church is no longer the Church of Christ, and that the gospel which she proclaims is no more their gospel, but rather a human corruption of it; and that the angels of God surrounding the apostles should confirm this solemn declaration; how should I, in my character of a Catholic bishop, receive this tremendous declaration? Would I kneel down and confess my errors, and, stripping off the insignia of my office, seek admission into some other Christian organization, which the apostles and the angelic host should indicate as the true Church of God? What I am about to say will

perhaps seem incredible, rash and almost blasphemous to some of you—to wit, that in such a case I should, without fear, declare that *I would not submit no, not even to the apostolic and angelic messengers, but declare both alike accursed (anathema)!*"

If this language is faithfully reported, it seems that the daring archbishop lacked but one thing to give completeness to his authoritative utterance—to wit, that if our blessed Lord should himself appear to confirm the declaration of His "apostolic and angelic messengers," the archbishop would repulse His condemnation with the self-same reply.

When a priest like Archbishop Ryan indulges in bravado like this, which Gregory VII. and Innocent III. never surpassed, what may we not expect from the rest of them? How true it is that the Roman priesthood, from the Pope down, *puts the Word of God, together with prophets, apostles and "angelic messengers," beneath their feet!*

I take for granted that the preacher explained and justified his strong language by that of Paul the apostle in Gal 1: 8, 9—"But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which ye have received, let him be anathema." (Revised version.) But the two cases have no resemblance. Paul by the inspiration and authority of God used this language with specific reference to those Judaizers who said of baptized Gentile believers: "It is needful to circumcise them, and to charge them to keep the law of Moses." "Except ye be circumcised

after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (Acts 15 : 1, 5). That is, that Christ could not save them without help from Moses, and that repentance of sin, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and Gospel obedience, no matter how real, intelligent and sincere, would be of no avail without Jewish rites and priestly sacrifices!

Just this (*malus mucandis*) neither more nor less, is what the Roman Church has done, and bared its breast to the fearful doom. And yet with singular effrontery Archbishop Ryan turns round upon Paul and tells him that if he or Peter and the apostolic host, sent as "messengers" from heaven, should affirm that his Church had forfeited its claim to be the Church of Christ, and that the gospel it teaches is not the Gospel which he prescribed, *let him and all the rest of them be accursed!* That Church holds and teaches that Christ cannot save us without help from the Pope; that the sacrifice of the cross avails nothing without the sacrifice of the mass, which Roman priests manage at their discretion; that repentance, faith and Gospel obedience lead but to hell without submission to the chair of St. Peter, and that not the Word of God, but the teaching of the Roman Church is the only rule of faith and duty.

Now, Archbishop Ryan knows as well as I do that all this formed no part of the gospel Paul preached and the Galatians received, but is directly opposed thereto; while penance, indulgences, image and picture worship, the invocation of saints and angels, the deification of Mary, the adoration of the host, auricular confession, and sacerdotal absolution, etc., were things not dreamed of till long after

apostolic times. His brave words, by which he would confirm men in the belief of a lie, he will be in no mood to repeat on that day when St Peter and St. Paul and the angelic host shall indeed appear in the company of their Lord, and every man give account of himself to God.

In contrast with this example of sacerdotal arrogance it will be both interesting and instructive to read the solemn admonition against boastful self-confidence, addressed by the Holy Spirit, more than 1,800 years ago to the Roman Church, while yet pure and faithful. Romish priests declare, and Archbishop Ryan among them, that Christ promised to that particular Church His infallible guidance and never failing favor; so that *it could not possibly fall away*. Just the reverse is true, for that particular Church was warned as no other ever was, that just as the Jewish Church had fallen away from God, and was cast off by Him, so the Roman was in great danger of doing likewise, and in that case it would be cut off in like manner.

Comparing the former to an olive tree, and the latter to a wild olive, Paul writes: "But if some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive, wast grafted in among them, and didst become partaker with them of the root of the fatness of the olive tree, glory not against the branches; but if thou gloriest, *thou bearest not the root, but the root thee*. Thou wilt say then: Branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. Well; because of their unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by thy faith. *Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God*

spared not the natural branches, neither will He spare thee. Behold, then, the goodness and severity of God; toward them that felt severity; but towards thee God's goodness, if thou continue in that goodness: *otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*" (Rom. 11. 17-21. Revised version.) The Roman Catholic versions are just as expressive.

To say, as the priests do, that this is a warning to individual Christians not to fall away from God, is too absurd to refute; for *how many branches would need be broken off to make room for one Gentile believer?* And that Church has a thousand times, to the letter, exhibited the very spirit against which Paul so solemnly warned their fathers, and of which Archbishop Ryan gives one of the last and most striking exhibitions.

Let the reader turn back and contrast the Archbishop's "great swelling words of vanity" with the solemn warning of Paul at which he scoffs; so far scoffs as to affirm that he would say to Paul's face, "let him be anathema," accursed from God, if he were sent back to tell him that the awful sins committed by that Church against God's word and against His saints for His word's sake, had forfeited for it the love and favor of God.

Give Catholics the Gospel.

While Archbishops Corrigan and Ireland and their press organs are reviling each other the people should be told that they are false guides on the way to heaven, and that there is a better way through and by the great High Priest, the Son of God, who will receive and make children of God all who come to Him by repentance and faith.

TWO NEW BOOKS.

BY REV. GEO. C. NEEDHAM.

PREACH THE WORD.

This volume contains eleven Bible Lectures by Mr. Needham on vital subjects. They are presented with great clearness and force, and are spiritually elevating, doctrinally sound, eminently practical. To all lovers of Bible studies they will prove suggestive and stimulating. These Expositions were given at Mr. Needham's Bible Conferences last spring in the Southern States. A brief biographical sketch, with engravings, of Messrs. Fife and Needham are added by request of many friends. Price, cloth 75 cents; paper 50 cents.

SCRIPTURE PLAN OF THE AGES.

A CHART, WITH EXPOSITION.

A much needed explanation of a profoundly important subject. It has been demonstrated through Mr. Needham's Bible Lectures on Prophecy that there is a ready ear for such teaching. But the author of this Chart and Key by no means enters upon speculative questions. He calls attention to what is revealed in the divine Word for the instruction of Christian believers. The chart is on stiff board, 16x11 inches. The pamphlet contains 30 pages. Price for Chart and Key-pamphlet, 30 cents.

Address all orders for the above to this office.

KIND WORDS.

From the Chicago *Free Methodist*, August 10, 1892:

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, published by Rev. James A. O'Connor, would be a benefit to every thinking Protestant in the land. It would be a blessing to any Roman Catholic who would read it.

THE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT OF PAPAL ARROGATIONS

BY MRS. MARY S. ROBINSON

IV.

HORMISDAS (514), for the preservation of the peace, elected in the presence of the deputy of Theodoric, king of Italy, exerted himself to compel the aged emperor (of the East) Anastasius, to an unconditional submission to certain Papal decrees—especially to the condemnation of the dead Acacius, who, as patriarch, had asserted an equality with the Roman pontiff and had promoted an imperial edict for universal toleration.

The emperor declared: "We may submit to insult; we may endure that our decrees be annulled; but we will not be commanded," and thereafter held himself aloof from his restive vassal, who could by no means hold a high tone to his nearer overlord, the sagacious, strong Theodoric, at that time virtual dictator of the religious world, and to whom Hormisdas comported himself as a dutiful subject. Meanwhile the patriarch of Constantinople received the imperial sanction to his title of Ecumenic, or universal.

John (523) was sent to that city by Theodoric to obtain privileges for the Arians, heretics, who were under the Papal ban; but as he failed to execute his commission to the satisfaction of his master, the latter thrust him in prison, where he died—a Pope dying in bonds imposed by the king of the country.

Felix III. (526) was the candidate put forward by Theodoric, and was accepted by the senate and clergy, naturally "only after a stubborn resistance" in view of the fate of John. The king, or emperor, as he was

named, eminent for his administrative ability, induced them to accept an agreement for future elections—the Popes to be chosen by the free suffrages of the clergy and people, but not to receive consecration till the election should be confirmed by the imperial endorsement. For such endorsement the Pope elect was to pay a given sum, which should be distributed among the poor—the first step toward buying the Papal mitre and chair. This method obtained till the election was transferred to the college of cardinals.

Boniface II. (530) fulminated an anathema against his dead and buried rival, as if to pronounce again from an earthly tribunal a sentence executed, to his certainty, in the invisible world. But the next Pope revoked the anathema, and so leaves us in doubt whether the Judge divine had also revoked His penalty and had released a tormented spirit from the fires in which it had agonized for a season. Boniface decreed that each pontiff after himself should nominate his successor; but the measure for evident reasons was so distasteful to the public that ere long he was constrained to condemn it in the usual language of Papal intensity as a violation of civil and ecclesiastical law, an act of treason, and publicly burned it. Erring so egregiously in a matter of ecclesiastical policy he was never impelled to demand homage for himself as infallible in things spiritual.

At the election of John II. (532) many sacred vessels, the property of churches, were sold for the procuring

of bribe money. The sanguinary conflicts of former days were renewed, notwithstanding the protests and edicts of the emperor and the senate; for the adherents of the Papal factions had fallen so far below the civil dignitaries in decorum and self-restraint as to incite the reproof and reproach of those dignitaries. Theodotus the Goth, compelled Agapetus (535) Pope, and son of a priest, to go to Constantinople on a threatening mission to Justinian; Agapetus consenting thus by force to be the bearer of menaces from a barbarian Arian to a Roman orthodox emperor. The dispatch informed Justinian that in case he should attempt to recover Italy the Goth would destroy Rome and would put the Roman senate to the sword. As no mention was made of Agapetus, it is hardly supposable that he possessed any actual temporal power over the city. He died while absent on this embassy.

Silverius (536), son of Pope Hormisdas, was degraded by Theodora, Justinian's empress, and banished to the islet, Pandataria, where, according to current reports, he starved to death. He had been put out of the way to make place for a favorite of ill-repute, Vigilius (537), who, like his patroness, was an Eutychean, a heretic, denying the two natures of the Lord—a false accuser, too, an oppressor, given to bribes and charged with murder. For it was alleged that he had killed his secretary in a fit of passion, and that by his command his nephew had been scourged to death. In the streets of Rome he was assailed with imprecations and hurled stones. "May famine and pestilence pursue thee! Evil hast thou done to us!

May terrors and evil overtake thee wherever thou art!" Summoned by the Eastern emperor to give a statement of belief, he thrice resisted, and, it is written, thrice yielded to the command, showing thus that his self-asserted authority, if any he assumed, was not of the firmest. He excommunicated Theodora after her death, and the patriarch of Constantinople; the latter of whom replied by a counter excommunication. Thereafter the bishops of the East held no communion with the uncertain, bitter spirited Pope. Italy and Africa revolted against his attempted rule. Mobbed in Constantinople, whither he had gone partly in a spirit of independence and partly to meet the imperial demands, he sought refuge in a church, whither troops were sent to arrest him. In the commotion of the fray the pillars of the *baldachino** (high altar) to which he clung gave way, and he went down beneath its ponderous fragments. He was drawn out, was made the mark of personal indignities, was nearly starved in a dungeon, as some writers aver, and after other hard experiences was exiled to the island rock—Proconnesus. Here after long solitude he came to agreement with the emperor (who, as has been previously stated, was everywhere recognized as the head of the Church universal) and was permitted to return to his See; but died on the journey before he reached it. Such was the tempestuous career of a Pope who failed to keep himself in accord with and to acknowledge the doctrinal supremacy of the Roman emperor of the East. Such likewise was the fate of one whose

* The baldachinos are usually of bronze, with decorations of other metal.

fickleness and folly were made manifest from the highest place of the hierarchy of the West—one of a dynasty which later laid claims to spiritual and doctrinal inerrancy; claims asserted for its past not less than for its present and future.

Pelagius (546) was involved in the coil of evil that had invested his predecessor. He had acquired wealth, none knew how, as a legate of the Eastern court. Elected with the favor of Justinian, he was yet unpopular from his Eastern associations, and was suspected of having had complicity with the severities practised on Vilius. He could not procure the number of bishops usually considered necessary for a Papal consecration, but secured this latter without it. The Tusculan bishops omitted his name from the prayers of their sacramental liturgy, and many of the monks, clergy and nobility of the Papal city withdrew from his communion. He excused himself in all directions; volunteered to give statements of his belief; and perhaps with the hope of winning over the African prelates took pains to laud Augustine for emphasising the doctrine of the foundation of the Church in the apostolic Sees, and for teaching that they are schismatics who separate themselves from the communion of those Sees. Himself declared repeatedly that in disputed questions the decision must rest with the four leading Sees, collectively, of Christendom; hence if his official character is worth anything the subsequent Papal assumption and the subsequent submission of things temporal and of things spiritual to the Popes is a direct denial of a Papal dictum. In other words, Papal authority in

matters of doctrine, Papal inerrancy, were virtually denied in advance by Pope Pelagius. In this respect Dr. Dollinger, the late leader of the Old Catholics, a man of vast learning and of undoubted discrimination, agreed with this ancient pontiff; for he and his colleagues of Western Germany, men who are authorities on the religious history of the mediæval and anti-mediæval cycles, believed that the gradual successive approximations to doctrinal truth obtained during those cycles were the result of the sifting, investigation, the labor of the councils.

When Childebert, king of France, required of Pelagius an explicit statement of the latter's belief, it was duly forwarded, the Pope writing that "to avoid suspicion, we (Popes) ought to give a declaration of faith to kings, to whom we owe respect and to whom the Scriptures command that we submit ourselves"

The three centuries of the Papal dynasty, whose record, as related to back and forward reaching claims of that dynasty, we have given, show that during one third of the Christian era, dating to the Reformation, the Popes were not theologians nor "Fathers;" that they were not of those who compacted the body of doctrine that was held by the Church at large; that the fathers of the faith wrote, taught and preached elsewhere than in the Roman See; that the election of the Popes was an election by factions, marked by the ferocities of political elections in a degraded, lawless state of society; that their elevation was permitted only by the sanction of the emperor of the East, whose authority as the human head of the Church went unchallenged, save only on occasion by

themselves; and when so challenged, nearly always to their discomfiture; that their mental limitations and moral infirmities were recognized by their associates and by the people generally; that the respect accorded them, as heads of the Western hierarchy, was simply commensurate, as a rule, with their ability to command it; that their authority beyond their See, and their gradually broached assumptions, were resisted by other bishops gathered in council—by those of Italy, Spain, Gaul, Carthage, Asia Minor, and most resolutely by the Eastern patriarchs; and that their spiritual character, as measured by the standard set by the eminently devout of their age, is not such as to inspire confidence in the assumptions ventured by certain of themselves, and made openly and broadly in succeeding centuries, that the individuals composing the dynasty were the direct, the absolute, representatives of the divine Founder of the Church.

Should any who may have taken some interest in this partial survey incline to follow it further, we refer them, among other works, to "L'Art de Verifier les Dates, etc.," by Francois Clement, four volumes. Jombert, Paris, 1783; to the "Pope and the Council," by Janus (Dr. Ignatius Dollinger and two colleagues); and to Dean Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," 8 volumes, Riverside edition; Hist. Eccles. l'Abbe Fleury.

Jesuits Electing a General.

The New York *Tribune*, August 16, 1892, had the following:

"Four prominent American Jesuits sailed last week for Europe to participate in the election of a general for

their order, which will be held in Rome at the end of this month, although the official residence of the Jesuits general is at Fiesole. Since last January the order has been governed by the vicar of the general, who died at that time. There is some speculation as to the outcome of the election, into which some new factors have entered. These factors are bound to exert an influence, it is thought, in spite of the rigid rules which guard the election of a general from intrigue and political wire-pulling. The rules require that a Jesuit voting has no ambition either for himself or others, under severe penalties, and every vote is deposited before a crucifix, in the name of Christ. Nevertheless, human nature has its proper place in the election.

"The Jesuit body is made up of great national groups, the Italian group numbering 1,764; the French, 2,863; the German, Belgian, Austrian and Dutch, 3,479; the Spanish, Portuguese, South American and Mexican, 2,600, and the English and American, 2,300. The 24 generals of the order numbered among them 11 Italians, 5 Spaniards, 3 Belgians, and 1 each from Germany, Switzerland, Poland, Bohemia and Holland. The English speaking group has not yet had a representative in the generalship, nor has the French group. An English or French general will not be elected, less from a desire to see the particular nationality represented than from a strong feeling that a general trained in either the French or English group would import new ideas and methods into the order. Once elected the general has no right or power to decline the office, but must serve as long as his health permits."

LIVES AND MIRACLES OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SAINTS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ROMAN BREVIARY, BY JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

CHAPTER V.

Barnabas, called an apostle, is the saint for June 11. The lessons for the day are from the Acts of the Apostles, somewhat "mutilated and disjointed," as the Marquis of Bute says in a note to his translation. But his translation of the lessons of the second nocturn is worse than mutilation, it is nothing less than forgery. That the reader may judge for himself the Latin text of the fourth lesson is here given, with the literal translation, and the Marquis of Bute's interpolated translation :

"Barnabas Levites, Cyprius genere qui et Joseph, cum Paulo Gentium Apostolus ordinatus est ad prædicandum Jesu Christi Evangelium. Is agro vendito, quem habebat, redactam ex eo pecuniam attulit Apostolis. Missus autem Antiochiam prædicationis causa, cum ibi multos ad Christi Domini fidem conversos esse comperisset, incredibiliter lætatus, eos hortabatur ut in Christi fide permanerent. Quo cohortatione multum proficiebat, quod ab omnibus vir bonus, et Spiritu sancto plenus habebatur." The following is the literal translation :

"Barnabas, a Levite, born in Cyprius, who was also called Joseph, with Paul was ordained an apostle of the Gentiles to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Having sold land that he possessed he brought the money thus acquired to the apostles. Being sent to Antioch in the cause of preaching, he there learned that many had been converted to the faith of the Lord Christ, and greatly rejoiced and exhorted them to continue steadfast in the faith of Christ. By which exhortation much good was accomplished, and he was esteemed by all a good man and filled with the Holy Spirit." And this is Bute's interpolation :

"Jones, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas (which is, being interpreted, the Son of Consolation), a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus, having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles feet (Acts 4: 36, 37) When Paul, after his conversion, was come to Jerusalem, the disciples were all afraid of him, but Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles. (9: 26, 27.) When tidings that a great number believed and turned unto the Lord at Antioch came unto the ears of the Church which was at Jerusalem, they sent forth Barnabas that he should go as far as Antioch. Who, when he came, and had seen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted them all that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord. For he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith, and much people was added unto the Lord. (11: 21-24)"

In the fifth lesson there is another interpolation in the Marquis of Bute's translation which is not found in the Latin text of the Breviary. Forgery is nothing new in the annals of the Roman Church, but it is passing strange that a "convert to Rome" of the Marquis of Bute's standing should countenance such deception in a prayer book that he commends to the Roman Catholic laity to read daily, after the manner of the priests, who are bound under pain of

mortal sin to read it attentively and devoutly. But as an English Jesuit priest was co-laborer in the work of translation, it was an easy matter for the Marquis to quiet his conscience in this matter by the usual arguments of the Jesuits.

It is believed by the peasantry of Roman Catholic countries that priests and bishops have power "to stick them to the ground," to put horns on them and inflict untold calamities upon them for opposing or disobeying their clerical masters. But in former times it is said all classes believed in this power of the priests. In the history of St. John of Facundez (June 12), who was a monk of the Augustinian order in the fifteenth century, the Breviary tells us that a nobleman whom the monk had offended sent two horsemen to waylay him on his journey. "They had come quite close to him when being divinely seized by fear they, with their horses, were immovably stuck to the ground, until they prostrated themselves at the feet of the saint and implored pardon for their sin. Again, some quarrelsome men who tried to beat him with clubs had their arms stiffened until they asked his pardon for their crime. He was accustomed to see the Lord Christ visibly present when celebrating mass, and he raised from the dead the seven year old daughter of his brother—*fatrisque filiam septennem mortuam excitavit*."

St. Basil the Great, who lived in the fourth century, became famous in maintaining that the Son is of one substance with the Father. His feast occurs on June 14. When Valens, the emperor, desired to banish him he was unable to sign the decree, we are solemnly told, as the chair in which he sat broke down, and three pens which he took up, one after the other, to sign the decree would not write, and his right hand, with shattered nerves violently shook. Valens' wife also was tormented with grievous pains, and their only son was taken ill. These signs alarmed the emperor so much that he acknowledged his wickedness, and sent for Basil, during whose visit the child began to get better. But when Valens called in some heretics to see the child it died soon afterwards. Basil was content to wear nothing but one single garment, and when he died his body showed nothing but skin and bone.

The Martyrs Vitus, Modestus and Crescentia are commemorated on June 15. By command of the Emperor Diocletian "they were thrown into a great vessel filled with melted lead, rosen and pitch, in which, like the three Hebrew children, they sang hymns. Being rescued thence, they were cast to a lion, but he laid down before them and kissed their feet."

Juliana, of Falconieri, whose feast occurs on June 19, was so modest that she never in her whole life lifted her eyes to behold the face of a man. Her example is commended to all nuns if they wish to continue in the faith and practice of Rome. She voluntarily starved herself to such a degree that she brought on disease of the stomach, and could not retain any food—not even the consecrated host. "In this condition she begged of the priest to place it near her heart. The priest complied with her request, and, wonderful! at the same moment the divine bread disappeared, and Juliana expired with a serene and smiling countenance."

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

SERVICES IN CHRIST'S MISSION.

142 WEST TWENTY FIRST ST., NEW YORK,
JAMES A. O'CONNOR, PASTOR.

Notwithstanding the extremely hot weather the evening service in the pretty chapel of Christ's Mission Sunday evening, July 24, was a most interesting one. While the congregation joined in singing a man entered and walked up the centre aisle until he arrived in front of the pastor who was conducting the service. When requested to be seated he declined, saying he was a sinful man, not fit for such good company. He was told that he was the most welcome person at the service, and if he was willing his sins would be forgiven and he could become a new creature, redeemed by the blood of Christ, a child of God and heir of the kingdom, even before he left the meeting. Prayer was offered for him and he accepted Christ and said he would trust Him. He said he had a good home and good influences around him in England, but he had gone astray and wandered into evil paths and fell by the wayside in this country, and now, encouraged by what he had seen and heard at this service, he would look to the Lord for help and strength to lead a better life. The pastor told him that all those at the meeting had been sinners of one kind or another, like himself, who had been redeemed by the blood of Christ, and that their Saviour would be his Saviour and Redeemer from that moment. The man was invited to make the Mission his home for the night, but he said he had a room near by, and would remember the kindness shown him in Christ's Mission

Brother Philemon Myers, who came to the Mission in July from Chicago where he had been superior of the Brothers of the Holy Cross in St. Pius' Roman Catholic Church, has been at work in a hotel at Ocean Grove, N. J., for the last month. He is an accomplished teacher and a good man. Father O'Connor said he would do what he could to find an opening for him in a business house. Unlike some priests and others who came to Christ's Mission helpless, Mr. Myers is energetic, and with God's help will succeed in obtaining a position.

THE COMING DAY.

BY MARIA A. WEST.

"The redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their head; and sorrow and mourning shall flee away." Isa. 51: 11.

Ch, the day of joy that's coming,
When the reign of sin is o'er,
And this earth renewed and ransomed,
Paradise shall bloom once more.

Coming, coming, surely coming,
Christ shall reign as Prince of Peace;
And through all His vast dominion
Strife and wrong and sorrow cease.

It is coming, surely coming,
Sing, my soul, with rapture sing!
For that day will then declare Him
Over all this earth the King.

Righteousness and truth for ever
Fill the world with love and light,
And the reign of wrong and error
Vanish in an endless night.

Eyes that wept shall shine with rapture
Hearts once broken sing for joy,
And the peace that passeth telling
Fill each soul without alloy.

Ay, that day is coming, coming,
Sing, my soul, rejoice and sing;
Like a "bride prepared" to meet Him
Who is coming as thy King.

—*London Christian.*